

Serial number: 10/815,420

#### REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to clarify the fact that the two layers recited in Claim 1 as Layer-1 and Layer-2 are contained within a multi-layer film and disposed between a dicing tape and a silicon wafer. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraphs [0001], first sentence, and [0007], last sentence, of the specification. The examples teach the use of lamination of two separate films as a means of constructing the multi-layer film, however, one skilled in the art would understand that other processes could be used for construction of a multi-layer film, including co-extrusion of two or more layers. The language "which comes in contact" has been changed to "in contact", to better describe an article.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 USC 112 as unclear in that the weight percent of the filler is inconsistent with the required weight percentages of the other components of the film. Applicants have amended paragraph [0010] of the specification and claims 4 and 5 to reflect that the greatest amount of filler that can be present is 55 weight %. This is supported by the weight percentages of the other components and simple arithmetic. Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out this inconsistency.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 5 to 8 due to incorrect dependencies. The dependencies have been corrected and the applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing this out.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Akada et al (US5476565). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Referring to Figures 1 and 2, in which "1" is the (dicing tape) substrate, Akada teaches the use of a film having a pressure-sensitive layer "2" and an adhesive layer "3". During processing, the pressure-sensitive layer "2" is partially cured by exposure to ultraviolet radiation. This reduces the adhesion of, or hardens, the pressure-sensitive layer "2" to the adhesive layer "3", facilitating release of the adhesive layer from the substrate "1" and pressure sensitive layer "2". The adhesive layer "3" and die are then adhered to a leadframe, and the pressure sensitive adhesive layer "2" remains on the substrate "1" (Akada et al, col 3, lines 14-18, col 4 lines 25-27, col 4 lines 65-67 and col 5 lines 1-5).

The current invention is an improvement over the art described in Akada. Applicant's invention does not require UV-exposure to enable release from the substrate (dicing tape) because the adhesion of Layer-1 to the dicing tape is low enough to enable release of the bonding film and die

Serial number: 10/815,420

together during die pickup (paragraphs 0007, 0009, and 0023). One skilled in the art understands that the use of an additional processing step, such as irradiation, is undesirable for cost and worker safety reasons, and its elimination is considered an advantage in the use of dicing die bonding films. It would not be obvious to one skilled in the art that adequate differentiation in adhesion properties could be achieved in light of Akada et al without the use of UV irradiation. The present invention achieves this through the use of the multi-layer structure.

Applicant urges the Examiner to reconsider for the above reasoning and come to the conclusion that the invention as claimed would not have been obvious in light of Akada et al.

With regard to US 2005/0046042, this application also appears to be directed to a firm that requires irradiation in order to release. If the Examiner has a specific objection or rejection relative to this art, applicant will respond when the objection or rejection is formalized.

Applicant requests the Examiner to remove the rejection on these grounds and respectfully urges an allowance.

END OF REMARKS